

1  
2  
3  
4

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8 NETWORK APPLIANCE, INC.,  
9 Plaintiff,

No. C-07-06053 EDL

10 | v.

11 SUN MICROSYSTEMS INC.,  
12 Defendant.

**ORDER TO TEMPORARILY FILE  
UNDER SEAL COURT'S NOVEMBER  
17, 2009 SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
ORDERS**

14 The Court hereby ORDERS that the following Orders, filed on November 17, 2009, are  
15 temporarily filed under Seal: Order Granting Sun's Motion No. 1 For Summary Judgment of Non-  
16 Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,892,211, Order Granting Sun's Motion No. 2 For Summary  
17 Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,892,211, Order Granting NetApp's Motion For  
18 Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,925,106, and Order Granting  
19 NetApp's Motion For Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,459,857. The  
20 Court intends to publish these four Orders in their entirety in the public record within ten (10) days  
21 of the date of this Order.

22 The Court does not believe that any of these Orders contains confidential information such  
23 that the Orders, or any portion thereof, should be sealed. However, if any party believes that the  
24 Court's Orders contain confidential information entitled to protection, that party shall file with the  
25 Court a declaration establishing why such protection is warranted and providing any proposed  
26 redactions not later than one week from the date of this Order. The Court cautions parties that there  
27 is a "strong presumption in favor of access" to Court files, especially those relating to case-  
28 dispositive motions and related documents, and a party seeking protection of such documents must  
present "'compelling reasons' sufficient to outweigh the public's interest in disclosure and justify  
sealing court records." See *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th

1 Cir. 2006). The “compelling reasons” standard is invoked even if the dispositive motion, or its  
2 attachments, were previously filed under seal or protective order. See Foltz v. State Farm Mut.  
3 Automobile Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1136 (9th Cir. 2003) (“[T]he presumption of access is not  
4 rebutted where . . . documents subject to a protective order are filed under seal as attachments to a  
5 dispositive motion. The . . . ‘compelling reasons’ standard continues to apply.”). A “good cause”  
6 showing, without more, will not satisfy the “compelling reasons” test and documents and/or briefs  
7 that do not satisfy this test may accordingly be re-designated as public information upon proper  
8 request. Id. Additionally, any request for protection should rigorously comply with the requirement  
9 of Local Rule 79-5 that it be “narrowly tailored to seek sealing of only sealable information.” The  
10 Court will not entertain requests for blanket sealing of the Orders, nor will it consider requests made  
11 without presenting compelling reasons for keeping the information sought to be protected  
12 confidential.

13  
14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated: November 16, 2009

16   
17 ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE  
18 United States Magistrate Judge  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28